

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-26 are pending. Claims 1-26 stand rejected. In this response, Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-16 and 18-26 and cancelled claims 6 and 17. Accordingly, claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18-26 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Whitehead (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0040476). Claims 4, 5, 7, 9-22, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Whitehead and Matthews, III (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,145). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. In particular, Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

...a program guide display unit configured to display the electronic program guide including moving pictures of a plurality of programs simultaneously.... (Emphasis added).

In the exemplary embodiment disclosed in Applicants' specification, this means that more than one moving picture is displayed in the electronic program guide at the same time. This feature may be found, for example, in the originally filed application at page 38, lines 4-10 and FIG. 23. No new matter has been added.

Whitehead discloses an electronic programming guide (EPG). As shown in Fig. 2, the EPG includes a grid display 2 made up of a grid of cells 4. A channel list 10 is provided along the y-axis of the grid and a time bar 6 is provided along the x-axis of the grid. When a user selects a particular cell corresponding to a program (e.g., a highlighted cell 12) and presses an information key on a remote control, a display window 16 appears. The display window 16 shows a moving picture (e.g., a preview) representing the selected program. See Whitehead, paragraphs 15-17.

Matthews discloses a video program guide. As shown in FIG. 4, the video program guide includes a display screen 98 made up of a grid of tiles 102. Each tile 102 corresponds to a program available on a selected channel during a schedule period. As with Whitehead, when a user selects a tile (e.g., focused tile 102(a)), a multi-frame video segment 104(a) is displayed. See Matthews col. 4, lines 44-55 and col. 5, lines 16-23 (a "selected" tile displays a multi-frame video segment and "other" tiles display single frame images). While Matthews discloses that

"at least one" programming tile includes a multi-frame video segment, Matthews does not disclose that more than one programming tile may display multi-frame video segments at the same time.

Accordingly, in both Whitehead and Matthews a user must select a tile in order for a moving picture to be displayed. Further, only one moving picture is displayed at a time in both references. Accordingly, neither Whitehead, nor Matthews, nor their combination, disclose or suggest "a program guide display unit configured to display the electronic program guide including moving pictures of a plurality of programs simultaneously," as required by Applicants' claim 1 (emphasis added).

It is because Applicants include the feature of "a program guide display unit configured to display the electronic program guide including moving pictures of a plurality of programs simultaneously," that the following advantages are achieved. Namely, a user is able to determine at a glance what programs are available at what times and for how long a duration.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 2-5, 7 and 13-16, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to allowable claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 7 and 13-16 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 8 and 19-22 include all the features of allowable claim 1 from which they depend. Claims 9-12 include all the features of allowable claim 7 from which they depend. Claims 18 and 26 include all the features of allowable claim 5 from which they depend. Claim 23 includes all the features of allowable claim 2 from which it depends. Claim 24 includes all the features of allowable claim 3 from which it depends. Claim 25 includes all the features of allowable claim 4 from which it depends. Thus, claims 8-12 and 18-26 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 13-16 have been amended and are now fully compliant with 35 U.S.C. § 101. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 101 rejection.

Application No.: 10/550,660  
Amendment Dated June 11, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of March 25, 2008

MAT-8753US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jacques L. Elkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738  
Attorney for Applicants

DK/dmw

Dated: June 11, 2008

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

NM269391